AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

In Figure 4, please insert the words "Prior Art" as shown in the red ink markup.

REMARKS

Claims 1-6, 9, 10, and 15 are currently pending. Claims 7, 8, and 11-13 are cancelled without prejudice.

The drawings, Figures 4 and 5 were objected to. Figure 4 is amended and Assignee presents Examiner with "Replacement Sheets". It is believed that the foregoing overcome the objections.

Claims 1, 2, 4, and 9, 10, and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Reitmeier. Claim 1 is amended to recite, among other limitations "writing the interlaced frame to a frame buffer" and "deinterlacing the interlaced frame, thereby resulting in a deinterlaced frame". Claims 4, 9, and 15 are amended to recite, among other limitations "a frame buffer for storing the interlaced frames" and "a deinterlacer for deinterlacing the interlaced frames, thereby resulting in deinterlaced frames".

Examiner has noted that Reitmeier "discloses video decoder 120 (Figs 1, 2) which is then deinterlaced via 130". Assignee notes that in Reitmeier, the de-interlacer 130 precedes the frame buffer 162. Reitmeier, Figs. 1 and 2. Thus, frames that are deinterlaced, are deinterlaced prior to the frame buffer. Thus, if Reitmeier "discloses video decoder 120 (Figs 1,2) which is then deinterlaced via 130" as asserted by Examiner, Reitmeier does not teach "a frame buffer for storing the interlaced frames" or "writing the interlaced frame to a frame buffer". Accordingly, Assignee respectfully requests that Examiner withdraw the rejections to 1, 4, 9, and 15, as well as dependent claims 2, 3, 4, 6, and 10.

5

Conclusion

For at least the foregoing reasons, each of the pending claims are allowable, thereby placing the application in a condition for allowance. A notice of allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: June 5, 2006

Mirut Dalal
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS
Reg. No. 44,052

McANDREWS, HELD & MALLOY
500 W. Madison - 34th Floor
Chicago, IL 60661
Phone: (312) 775-8000
FAX: (312) 775-8100